

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Plaintiff-Appellee.

v.

No. 95-5937

RONALD MAURICE WOODS,
Defendant-Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Western District of Virginia, at Abingdon.
Samuel G. Wilson, District Judge.
(CR-95-7-A)

Submitted: December 12, 1996

Decided: December 23, 1996

Before MURNAGHAN, NIEMEYER, and LUTTIG,
Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

COUNSEL

G. Walter Bressler, BRESSLER, CURCIO & STOUT, P.C., Bristol,
Virginia, for Appellant. Robert P. Crouch, Jr., United States Attorney,
S. Randall Ramseyer, Assistant United States Attorney, Abingdon,
Virginia, for Appellee.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit. See Local Rule 36(c).

OPINION

PER CURIAM:

Ronald Maurice Woods appeals his conviction of possession of a firearm by a convicted felon in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 922(g)(1) (1994). We affirm.

On September 15, 1994, police officers stopped Woods after they clocked his car on radar as going seventy-four miles per hour in a sixty-five mile per hour zone. The officers advised Woods that he had been pulled over for speeding, and they asked for his license and registration. Woods could not find either and became increasingly nervous. The officers asked Woods if he had any illegal drugs or weapons in his car and asked if they could search his car. Woods told them to "go ahead." Woods asserts that the district court erred in denying his motion to suppress evidence obtained from the search and that the district court abused its discretion in admitting into evidence money, a beeper, rolling papers, and an address book obtained in the same search.

The record shows that the district court did not err in denying Woods' motion to suppress because Woods testified that when he gave the officers permission to search he did not object to the search of his car. See United States v. Gordon, 895 F.2d 932, 938 (4th Cir.), cert. denied, 498 U.S. 846 (1990). Further, the district court did not abuse its discretion in admitting into evidence the other items found in the car because it gave an adequate limiting instruction to the jury eliminating any undue prejudice. See United States v. Russell, 971 F.2d 1098, 1104-05 (4th Cir. 1992), cert. denied, 506 U.S. 1066 (1993); United States v. Jones, 907 F.2d 456, 460 (4th Cir. 1990), cert. denied, 498 U.S. 1029 (1991).

We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED